



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,639	12/22/2003	John C. Bell	18003-D1	8222

31976 7590 01/11/2005

LEWIS J. KREISLER
LEGAL DEPARTMENT
930 CLOPPER ROAD
GAITHERSBURG, MD 20878

EXAMINER

ZEMAN, ROBERT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1645

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/743,639

Applicant(s)

BELL ET AL.

Examiner

Robert A. Zeman

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-1-2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1645

DETAILED ACTION

Upon further review of the record an unintentional typographical error was found in the claims listed as rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. Hence, the previous Office has been vacated. Below is the corrected Office action.

Claims 1-20 are pending and currently under examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 4-1-2004 is acknowledged. Initialed copies are attached hereto. It should be noted that not all of the cited references were available and consequently were not considered. Said references will be considered as they become available.

Sequence Compliance

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). Specifically, Figures 14-23 contain sequences without the requisite sequence identifiers. Therefore, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.821-1.825. Applicant is given the same period in which to comply with the sequence rules as is available to reply to this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1645

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for methods utilizing VSV for reducing the viability of cell lines *in vitro* and the use of VSV to reduce the viability of tumor cell based xenographs in immunodeficient mice, does not reasonably provide enablement for the utilization of any virus other than VSV (that are not common human pathogens) for the reduction of viability of all types of carcinoma tumor cells (either *in vivo* or *in vitro*) or the utilization of any virus to reduce the viability of a tumor cell in an immunocompetent animal. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Enablement is considered in view of the Wands factors (MPEP 2164.01(A)). These include: nature of the invention, breadth of the claims, guidance of the specification, the existence of working examples, state of the art, predictability of the art and the amount of experimentation necessary.

In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) states, "The amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to the amount of knowledge in the state of the art as well as the predictability in the art." "The "amount of guidance or direction" refers to that information in the application, as originally filed, that teaches exactly how to make or use the invention. The more that is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention, how to make, and how to use the invention, and the more predictable the art is, the less information needs to be explicitly stated in the specification. In contrast, if little is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention and the art is unpredictable, the specification would need more detail as to how to make and use the invention in order to be

Art Unit: 1645

enabling” (MPEP 2164.03). The MPEP further states that physiological activity can be considered inherently unpredictable. Thus, Applicant assumes a certain burden in establishing that inventions involving physiological activity are enabled. All of the Wands factors have been considered with regard to the instant claims, with the most relevant factors discussed below.

Nature of the invention: The instant claims are drawn to methods of reducing the viability of carcinoma tumor cells by administering a virus to said carcinoma tumor cells. Said carcinoma tumor cells can optionally be lung carcinoma cells (claim 2), have no PKR activity (claim 3 and 4) or have no STAT1 activity (claim 4). The virus can be a picornavirus (claim 5) or Rhabdovirus generally (claims 5 or 6) or vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV) specifically (claim 7). Said VSV virus can be unable to inactivate tumor cell PKR activity (claims 8 and 19), may be attenuated (claim 9) or may constitute strains M1-M5 (claims 10-14 respectively). Said method may be drawn to methods of “treating” tumor cells which reside in a mammalian host (claims 15-20). Said virus may be administered to the mammalian subject via virally infected cells (claim 17) or the direct administration of VSV (claim 18) with the optional administration of interferon prior to the administration of the virus (claim 20).

Breadth of the claims: The claims are extremely broad in that they encompass literally any virus that is not a common human pathogen. Moreover, claims 15-20 are specifically drawn to the *in vivo* application of the claimed methods (i.e. treatment of a carcinoma tumor cell within an animal) while claims 1-14 encompass both *in vivo* and *in vitro* applications. It should be noted that all the instant claims read on the *in vivo* treatment of carcinoma tumor cells in humans.

Guidance of the specification/The existence of working examples:

To use the invention as claimed one must be able to differentially infect a susceptible tumor cell resulting in a reduction in said cell's viability. While the specification provides great detail on the susceptibility of different cell types to VSV and the protective effect of alpha interferon against VSV infection, the specification is silent on the what viruses other than VSV would induce the claimed anti-tumor effect. Additionally, the instant claims are drawn to all forms of carcinoma tumor cells, while the specification has demonstrated only two ovarian carcinoma cell lines (A2780 and C13), a colon carcinoma cell line (HCT 116), a lung carcinoma cell line (LC80) and a human prostate carcinoma cell line (LNCAP) that are that are susceptible to VSV infection. (see Table 1 and page 28 of the specification). Additionally, VSV was shown to reduce the viability of both LNCAP and A2780 cell lines were rapidly destroyed by VSV infection *in vitro* (see Table 2 and page 28 of the specification). The specification is silent on what receptor is utilized by VSV (or any other virus) for cell entry or which cell types would be able to support a productive viral infection making it difficult to determine if a given tumor cell would be susceptible to the oncolytic properties of VSV or be used as a suitable delivery vehicle. Moreover, the specification is equally silent on what other carcinoma tumor cell types are killed by VSV infection. The invention seems to be predicated on susceptible tumor cells lacking PKR activity, but the specification is silent on which carcinoma tumor cells lack said function. Claims 15-20 are specifically drawn to the *in vivo* application of the claimed methods while claims 1-14 encompass both *in vivo* and *in vitro* applications.

State of the art: At the time of applicants' invention the art of using oncolytic viruses to treat carcinomas wherein said virus was not a common human pathogen was underdeveloped.

Art Unit: 1645

While the use of oncolytic viruses has been known in the art for decades, said oncolytic viruses were limited, to viruses that would be considered human pathogens.

Predictability of the art and the amount of experimentation necessary:

People of skill in the art require evidence that a benefit can be derived by the therapeutic application of a given substance; however, a survey of the relevant art does not indicate that substances such as those claimed provide such benefit. The instant specification fails to provide significant direction on which viruses, if any, are capable of eliciting a therapeutic response (tumor cell death) when administered to an immunocompetent subject in need. Moreover, the specification is equally silent on how said viruses are to be administered to said subject. Jain discloses known barriers to the delivery of drugs into solid tumors (Scientific American Vol. 271 No. 1, pages 58-65, July 1994). Impediments to drug delivery include: (1) Non-uniform blood delivery to all areas of the tumor in which some areas of the tumor receive therapeutic agents and other areas of the tumor receive no therapeutic agent at all. (Page 60 col. 3); (2) Increased viscosity of blood in the tumor itself which also hinders drug delivery to the tumor (see paragraph bridging pages 60 and 61) and (3) High liquid pressures in the interstitial matrix can retard the delivery of large therapeutic agents, such as antibodies, into tumors (page 61, Col. 1 paragraph 1). Consequently, the method of administration would vary depending on the tumor cell type and location of said tumor. Unfortunately, the specification fails to provide guidance to how a given virus should be administered when treating a given carcinoma. The specification illustrates this point on page 33 where it states that PKR^{-/-} mice were killed with VSV by several

Art Unit: 1645

routes of infection but that these mice were not affected by intravenous injections of the virus. Moreover, there is a marked difference in the efficacy of delivering a therapeutic agent to a solid tumor cell as opposed to a leukemia cell.

The specification teaches how to use VSV to reduce the viability of melanoma cell lines injected into immunodeficient mice to form xenographs and provides *in vitro* data showing effects of VSV infection on a single melanoma cell line (either with or without alpha interferon). However, the specification does not provide any basis for correlating the *in vitro* results with beneficial effects that could reasonably be expected when said viruses are administered *in vivo* to "treat" carcinoma tumor cells, although *in vivo* use is clearly encompassed by the claims. Lacking either direct evidence for *in vivo* benefit, or a reasonable basis for correlating the *in vitro* and xenograft data as exemplified in the instant specification with *in vivo* benefit. Hence, the specification cannot be said to teach how to use the claimed viruses as pharmaceuticals without undue experimentation. Moreover, while those of skill in the art recognize that *in vitro* assays and or cell-cultured based assays are somewhat useful to observe basic physiological and cellular phenomenon such as screening the effects of potential drugs, clinical correlations are generally lacking. The greatly increased complexity of the *in vivo* environment as compared to the very narrowly defined and controlled conditions of an *in vitro* assay does not permit a single extrapolation of *in vitro* assays to *in vivo* efficacy with any reasonable degree of predictability. *In vitro* assays cannot easily assess cell-cell interactions that may be important in a particular pathological state. Furthermore it is well known in the art that cultured cells, over a period time, lose phenotypic characteristics associated with their normal counterpart cell type. Freshney (Culture of Animal Cells, A Manual of Basic Technique, Alan R. Liss, Inc., 1983, New York,

Art Unit: 1645

page 4) teach that it is recognized in the art that there are many differences between cultured cells and their counterparts *in vivo*. These differences stem from the dissociation of cells from a three-dimensional geometry and their propagation on a two-dimensional substrate. Specific cell interactions characteristic of histology of the tissue are lost. The culture environment lacks the input of the nervous and endocrine systems involved in homeostatic regulation *in vivo*. Without this control, cellular metabolism may be more constant *in vitro* but may not be truly representative of the tissue from which the cells were derived. This has often led to tissue culture being regarded in a rather skeptical light (p. 4, see Major Differences *In Vitro*). Moreover, Dermer (Bio/Technology, 1994, Vol. 12 page 320) teaches that, "petri dish cancer" is a poor representation of malignancy, with characteristics profoundly different from the human disease. Further, Dermer teaches that when a normal or malignant body cell adapts to immortal life in culture, it takes an evolutionary type step that enables the new line to thrive in its artificial environment. This step transforms a cell from one that is stable and differentiated to one that is not. Yet normal or malignant cells *in vivo* are not like that. The reference states that evidence of the contradictions between life on the bottom of a lab dish and in the body has been in the scientific literature for more than 30 years. Clearly it is well known in the art that cells in culture exhibit characteristics different from those *in vivo* and cannot duplicate the complex conditions of the *in vivo* environment involved in host-tumor and cell-cell interactions.

Additionally, it should be noted that Example 25 is insufficient to provide enablement for the full breadth of the instant claims. Firstly, the xenographs utilized in Example 25 (on page 50 of the specification), comprise a melanoma derived cell line (SK-MEL3). Secondly, said example only utilizes two of the five VSV mutants disclosed in the instant specification

Art Unit: 1645

suggesting that the anti-tumor effect of the disclosed VSV mutants is unpredictable. Thirdly, the instant claims are drawn to use of VSV to reduce the viability of all types of carcinoma tumor cells whereas Example 25 demonstrates only that two mutated VSV viruses can reduce the viability of cell-line based xenographs in immunodeficient mice. This cannot be extrapolated to the use of wild-type (non-mutated) VSV against established tumors in an immunocompetent animal. Gura (Science, Vol. 278, 1997 pages 1041-1042) teach that xenographs are not good models for determining the efficacy of a treatment modality since “xenograft tumors don’t behave like naturally occurring tumors in humans” (see column 2). Gura illustrates the lack of correlation between efficacy in xenograft model systems and *in vivo* efficacy in humans when she states that the use of xenografts led them to discover “compounds that were good mouse drugs rather than good human drugs” (see the bottom of column 2 on page 1041).

Consequently, the specification while being enabling for methods utilizing VSV for reducing the viability of cell lines *in vitro* and the use of VSV to reduce the viability of tumor cell based xenografts in immunodeficient mice, does not reasonably provide enablement for the utilization of any virus other than VSV (that are not common human pathogens) for the reduction of viability of all types of carcinoma tumor cells (either *in vivo* or *in vitro*) or the utilization of any virus to reduce the viability of a carcinoma tumor cell in an immunocompetent animal. The specification does not enable any person of skill in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the

Art Unit: 1645

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

It is apparent that the VSV strains M1, M2, M3, M4 and M5 are required in order to practice the invention. The deposit of biological organisms is considered by the Examiner to be necessary for the enablement of the current invention (see 37 CFR 1.808(a)).

If the deposit is made under terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by Applicants or person(s) associated with the patent owner (assignee) who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the deposit has been made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty *and* that all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirements. See 37 CFR 1.808.

If a deposit is not made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit, or declaration by Applicants or person(s) associated with the patent owner (assignee) who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the following criteria have been met:

- 1) during the pendency of the application, access to the deposit will be afforded to one determined by the Commissioner to be entitled thereto;
- 2) all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent; and
- 3) the deposits will be maintained for a term of at least thirty (30) years from the date of the deposit or for the enforceable life of the patent or for a period of at least five (5) years after the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited material, whichever is longest; and
- 4) a viability statement in accordance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.807; and
- 5) the deposit will be replaced should it become necessary due to inviability, contamination or loss of capability to function in the manner described in the specification.

In addition, the identifying information set forth in 37 CFR 1.809(d) should be added to the specification. See 37 CFR 1.803 – 1.809 for additional explanation of these requirements.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1645

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the phrase "not a common human pathogen". While the specification defines said term as "a virus that is found mostly in non-human hosts" and "viruses that are not typically found in the general human population" (see page 10, lines 10-12), it is unclear what constitutes the metes and bounds of the claimed invention since the specification doesn't define the limits of "found mostly in human hosts" or typically found in general human populations. Moreover, VSV infection is a common problem with farmers and other people who come in contact with soil (Fields Virology 3rd Edition, page 1140). Said infections result in the formation of dermal blisters (vesicles). Consequently, VSV can reasonably be classified as a "common human pathogen" which is contrary to the instant claims and the instant specification. Alternatively, it is unclear whether a recombinant virus derived from a common human pathogen would be considered "a common human pathogen" since the recombinant virus is not found in the population at large. Finally, the specification provides contradictory disclosures when it states, on one hand, that adenoviruses are considered a "common human pathogen" (see page 6, lines 10-11) and on the other hand, recite adenoviruses as a preferred embodiment of the claimed invention (see page 4, lines 14-16). It may be remedial to amend the claims to include language that clearly defines what is intended by the cited phrase.

Art Unit: 1645

Claim 3 is rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the term "substantially no PKR activity". It is unclear what is meant by said term since it is subjective in nature and is not explicitly defined in the specification. At what level of activity does PKR activity become "substantially no" PKR activity?

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-2 and 5-7 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 and 6-9 of copending Application No. 10/717,101. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

The claims of the instant application are drawn to methods of reducing the viability of a carcinoma tumor cell comprising administering to said tumor cell a virus that is not a common human pathogen wherein said virus is vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV). The claims of application 10/717,101 are drawn to a method of reducing or eliminating neoplastic cells *ex vivo* from a mixed population of cells wherein said method comprises contacting the cell population with a

Art Unit: 1645

virus (i.e. VSV). Hence, both claim sets encompass the reduction of viability (killing/elimination) of tumor cells by the administration of VSV *ex vivo* (i.e. not within the body of an animal). It should be noted that while the claims of application 10/717,101 are drawn to all neoplastic cells and do not explicitly recite the use of carcinoma tumor cells in the claimed method, their use was contemplated by the inventors (see paragraph 027 of the specification of application 10/717,101). The skilled artisan in order to practice the methods recited in the claims of application 10/717,101 would necessarily look to the specification to determine what cell types are encompassed by the term "neoplastic cells". Thus it would have been an obvious variation recited methods to use melanoma tumor cells.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 15-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Roberts et al. (WO 99/18799).

Roberts et al. disclose methods utilizing oncolytic viruses to treat (kill) neoplasms wherein said treatment comprises contacting the neoplastic tumor cells with the virus (see

Art Unit: 1645

abstract). Roberts et al. further disclose that the oncolytic virus can be vesicular stomatitis virus (see page 21 and Table 1) and that VSV was capable of tumor cell specific killing (i.e. VSV selectively infects tumor cells deficient in IFN responsiveness and not "normal" cells)[see page 26, first paragraph]. Moreover, Roberts et al. disclose that their methods could be used to treat carcinomas (see page 30, last paragraph). Consequently, Roberts et al. anticipates all the limitations of the rejected claims.

Claims 1- 2, 15-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McCormick (U.S. Patent 5,677,178 - IDS).

The instant claims are drawn to methods of reducing the viability of carcinoma tumor cells by administering a virus that is not a common human pathogen.

McCormick discloses methods utilizing genetically reengineered adenoviruses to treat neoplasms (see abstract). McCormick further discloses "a human patient or non-human mammal having a bronchial carcinoma, nasopharyngeal carcinoma, laryngeal carcinoma, small cell and non-small cell lung carcinoma, lung adenocarcinoma, hepatocarcinoma, pancreatic carcinoma, bladder carcinoma, colon carcinoma, breast carcinoma, cervical carcinoma, ovarian carcinoma or lymphatic leukemias may be treated by administering an effective anti-neoplastic dosage of an appropriate replication deficient adenovirus" (see column 16, lines 56-66). Moreover, McCormick discloses that the functionality the recombinant adenoviruses is predicated on the lack of p53/RB in the target cells and the inability of the recombinant adenovirus to activate p53/RB in normal cells. Additionally, McCormick et al. disclose multiple routes of administration (see column 16, line 65 to column 17, line 14). Since the *recombinant*

Art Unit: 1645

adenoviruses disclosed are not common human pathogens, McCormick anticipates all the limitations of the instant claims.

Claims 1-2, 5-7 and 15-18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Molnar-Kimber et al. (WO99/45783 --IDS).

Molnar-Kimber et al. disclose the use of producer cells for the delivery of oncolytic viruses to tumor cells in a subject (see abstract). Molnar-Kimber et al. further disclose that said producer cells could be used to deliver VSV to tumor cells (see page 15, lines 10-11). Moreover, Molnar-Kimber et al. disclose that said producer cells could be used to treat/kill lung cancer tumor cells (see Example 1) and that said producer cells could be delivered via multiple routes (see page 21, lines 9-12). Consequently, Molnar-Kimber et al. anticipates all the limitations of the rejected claims.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert A. Zeman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0866. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7 am - 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 1645

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith can be reached on (571) 272-0864. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Robert A. Zeman
January 6, 2005